

The Gazette of India



PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

No. 19] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, MAY 7, 1960/VAISAKHA 17, 1882

NOTICE

The undermentioned *Gazettes of India Extraordinary* were published upto the 28th April, 1960:—

| Issue No. | No. and date | Issued by | Subject |
|-----------|---|---------------------------------|--|
| 50 | 52-ITC(PN)/60, dated the 22nd April, 1960. | Ministry of Commerce & Industry | Import policy for Raw Jute for the period April—September, 1960. |
| 51. | 53-ITC(PN)/60, dated the 23rd April, 1960. | Do. | Import of spare parts of Electric Motors for use with calculating Machines. |
| | 54-ITC(PN)/60, dated the 23rd April, 1960. | Do. | Import licensing of Capital Goods and Heavy Electrical Plant. |
| | 55-ITC(PN)/60, dated the 23rd April, 1960. | Do. | Grant of supplementary licences for books falling under S. Nos. 169-170/IV—April—September, 1960, period. |
| 52. | SC(A) 2(20)/59/C, dated the 26th April, 1960. | Ministry of Steel, Mines & Fuel | Decision on the Tariff Commission Report on the retention prices payable to the Mysore Iron and Steel Works for Steel and Pig Iron produced by them. |
| 53. | 56-ITC(PN)/60, dated the 27th April, 1960. | Ministry of Commerce & Industry | Import of Raw Wool, Wool tops, shoddy wool, permissible types of dyes, chemicals etc., against export of woollen goods, Carpets etc. |
| 54. | 57-ITC(PN)/60, dated the 28th April, 1960. | Do. | Import policy for April—September, 1960 period—Grant of licences on yearly/repeat basis. |

Copies of the *Gazettes Extraordinary* mentioned above will be supplied on Indent to the Manager of Publications, Civil Lines, Delhi. Indents should be submitted so as to reach the Manager within ten days of the date of issue of these *Gazettes*.

CONTENTS

| PAGES | PAGES |
|-------|---|
| 105 | PART II—SECTION 4.—Statutory Rules and Orders notified by the Ministry of Defence 95 |
| 255 | PART III—SECTION 1.—Notifications issued by the Auditor General, Union Public Service Commission, Railway Administration, High Courts, and the Attached and Sub-ordinate Offices of the Government of India (<i>Published at Simla</i>) 643 |
| 29 | PART III—SECTION 2.—Notifications and Notices issued by the Patent Office, Calcutta (<i>Published at Simla</i>) 127 |
| 105 | PART III—SECTION 3.—Notifications issued by or under the authority of Chief Commissioners (<i>Published at Simla</i>) 37 |
| Nil | PART III—SECTION 4.—Miscellaneous Notifications including notifications, orders, advertisements and notices issued by Statutory Bodies (<i>Published at Simla</i>) 243 |
| 745 | PART IV—Advertisements and Notices by Private individuals and Private bodies (<i>Published at Simla</i>) 95 |
| 1391 | SUPPLEMENT No. 17— Reported attacks and deaths from cholera, smallpox, plague and typhus in districts in India during week ending 9th April, 1960 219 Births and deaths from principal diseases in towns with a population of 30,000 and over in India during week ending 9th April, 1960 222 |

PART I—Section 1

Notifications relating to Non-Statutory Rules, Regulations and Orders and Resolutions issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than the Ministry of Defence) and by the Supreme Court

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

New Delhi, the 29th April 1960

No. 17-ECI/60.—The following Members of the Lok Sabha have been elected to serve on the Committee on Estimates for the period commencing from the 1st May, 1960 to the 30th April, 1961:—

- (1) Shri Premji R. Assar,
- (2) Shri C. R. Basappa,
- (3) Shri Chandra Shanker,
- (4) Shri H. C. Dasappa,
- (5) Shri Dinesh Singh,
- (6) Shri Shambhu Charan Godsora,
- (7) Shri H. C. Heda,
- (8) Shri Yadav Narayan Jadhav,
- (9) Shri D. A. Katti,
- (10) Shri Khushwaqt Rai,
- (11) Shri Bhausaheb Raosaheb Mahagaonkar,
- (12) Rani Manjula Devi,
- (13) Shri Bibhuli Mishra,
- (14) Shri G. S. Musafir,
- (15) Shri M. Muthukrishnan,
- (16) Shri K. P. Kuttikrishnan Nair,
- (17) Shri Jagat Nath Prasad Pahadia,
- (18) Shri P. T. Thanu Pillai,
- (19) Shri P. T. Punnoose,
- (20) Shri Raghunath Singh,
- (21) Shri T. Nagi Reddy,
- (22) Shri Vutukuru Rami Reddy,
- (23) Sardar Amar Singh Saigal,
- (24) Shri Satis Chandra Samanta,
- (25) Shri Kailash Patil Sinha,
- (26) Shri Tavappa Hari Sonavane,
- (27) Shri Sunder Lal,
- (28) Shri A. M. Tariq,
- (29) Shri Mahavir Tyagi,
- (30) Shri M. G. Ukey.

No. 17-ECI/60.—The Speaker has been pleased to appoint Shri H. C. Dasappa as Chairman of the Committee on Estimates for the period commencing from the 1st May, 1960 to the 30th April, 1961.

A. K. RAY, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 30th April 1960

No. 3(1)-PAC/60.—The following Members of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha have been duly elected to serve as Members of the Committee on Public Accounts for the term beginning on the 1st May, 1960 and ending on the 30th April, 1961.

Members of Lok Sabha

1. Shri Upendranath Barman.
2. Shri Feroze Gandhi.
3. Shri Maneklal Maganlal Gandhi.
4. Shri R. S. Kiledar.
5. Shri Vinayak Rao K. Koratkar.
6. Shri T. Manaen.
7. Shri G. K. Maney.
8. Shri S. A. Matin.
9. Shri Baishnab Charan Mullick.
10. Shri T. R. Neswi.
11. Shri Shamrao Vishnu Parulekar.
12. Shri Purushottamdas R. Patel.
13. Shri Radha Raman.
14. Dr. N. C. Samantsinhar.
15. Pandit Dwarka Nath Tiwary.

Members of Rajya Sabha

16. Shrimati Sharda Bhargava.
17. Shri Jashaud Singh Bisht.
18. Shri Surendra Mohan Ghose.

19. Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.
20. Shri V. C. Kesava Rao.
21. Shri Mulka Govind Reddy.
22. Shri Jaswant Singh.

The Speaker has been pleased to appoint Shri Upendranath Barman as the Chairman of the Committee.

V. SUBRAMANIAN, Dy. Secy.

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

RESOLUTION

CUSTOMS

New Delhi, the 7th May 1960

No. 25/197/59-Cus.III.—With reference to the Resolution of the Government of India in the late Department of Commerce, No. 5474, dated the 19th October, 1922, the Central Government has decided that the list of cotton piecegoods appended to the Resolution of the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance (Revenue Division) No. 250(8)-Cus. I/48, dated the 30th April, 1948, may be amended as follows:—

Delete the existing item "Handkerchiefs in the piece i.e. woven in the piece and not joined only by the warp".

ORDER

Ordered that a copy of the Resolution be communicated to all concerned.

Ordered also that the Resolution be published in the Gazette of India for general information.

S. VENKATESAN, Dy. Secy.

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

New Delhi, the 27th April 1960

No. 4(24)-TEX-C/58.—The Government of India hereby appoint Shri Vital Rao Powar, President of the Hyderabad Central Handloom Weavers' Co-operative Association Limited, Hyderabad, as a member of the All India Handloom Board which was reconstituted *vide* this Ministry's Resolution No. 4(24)-TEX-C/58, dated the 27th November, 1958, in the place of Shri Konda Laxman, who has resigned his membership.

A. G. V. SUBRAMANIAM, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 29th April 1960

No. 82-SSI(B)(3)/56.—In pursuance of Clause (A) of Bye-law 28 of the Registered Bye-laws of the Delhi Garments Cooperative Industrial Society Ltd., New Delhi the following amendment shall be made in this Ministry's Notification No. 82-SSI(B)(3)/56 dated the 10th October, 1957.

For the words

"For a period of one year" occurring in lines 7 and 8 of the said notification.

Substitute the following:—

"till 1st June, 1960."

M. R. BHARDWAJ, Under Secy.

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 27th April 1960

No. L.E.Ind.80(21)/58.—In paragraph I of this Ministry's Resolution No. L.E. Ind. 80(21)/58, dated the 17th January, 1959 published in Part I, Section 1 of the Gazette of India dated the 24th January, 1959 regarding the constitution of a Panel with a view to develop the manufacture of clocks, time-pieces and watches in India, the name and particulars against Serial No. 21, *viz.*

Shri S. C. Banerjee, Deputy Development Officer, L.M.E. Directorate, Development Wing, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Udyog Bhavan, New Delhi.—Member-Secretary.

shall be substituted by the following:

Shri H. N. Risbud, Deputy Development Officer, L.M.E. Directorate, Development Wing, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Udyog Bhavan, New Delhi.—Member-Secretary.

ORDER

Ordered that a copy of the above corrigendum be communicated to all concerned and that it be published in the Gazette of India.

K. N. SHENOY, Dy. Secy.

MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

(Department of Agriculture)

New Delhi, the 27th April 1960

No. F.10-1/60-FAO.—The following members of the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha have been elected to serve as members of the National F.A.O. Liaison Committee in accordance with the late Ministry of Agriculture (now Food and Agriculture) Resolution No. F.16-72/47-Polcv, dated the 8th November, 1948, as subsequently amended, for a period of three years with effect from the date noted against each:—

(a) *Lok Sabha*.

1. Shri Ranbir Singh Chaudhuri, 1st June, 1960.
2. Shri D. R. Chavan, 1st June, 1960.
3. Shri C. Bali Reddy, 1st June, 1960.
4. Shri Banarsi Prasad Sinha, 1st June, 1960.

(b) *Rajya Sabha*.

1. Shri Jai Narain Vyas, date of issue of notification.

S. MULLICK, Jt. Secy.

MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER

New Delhi, the 22nd April 1960

No. EL-II-11(1)/60.—In pursuance of paragraph 2 of the late Ministry of Works, Mines and Power Resolution No. EL-II-151(7), dated the 30th May 1949, as subsequently amended by Corrigenda No. EL-II-151(7), dated the 16th July, 1949, and the 29th August, 1949, and in partial modification of the Ministry of Irrigation and Power Notification No. EL.III-11(4)/60 dated the 31st July, 1959, as amended by Notifications No. EL-II-11(1)/60, dated the 23rd February, 1960, the 8th March, 1960 and the 18th March, 1960, the Central Government is pleased to appoint Shri S. Muthuswamy, Divisional Engineer, Telegraphs, Technical and Development Circle, Jabalpur, as a Member of the Central Standing Committee of Co-ordination of Power and Telecommunication Lines vice Shri A. Banerjee.

N. S. VASANT,
Officer on Special Duty.

RESOLUTION

New Delhi, the 2nd May 1960

No. 4/5/60-DW.VI.—In the resolution of the Government of India in the Ministry of Irrigation and Power No. 4/20/56-DW.VI, dated the 1st November, 1956 as amended by resolution No. 4/6/58-DW.VI, dated the 29th October, 1958, in item (ii) of entries under "Bhakra Control Board" the words, letter and brackets "(Shri T. Sivasankar)" shall be omitted.

ORDER

Ordered that the above amended be communicated to the Governments of Punjab and Rajasthan and the Himachal Pradesh Administration, the Ministries of the Government of India, Prime Minister's Secretariat, Cabinet Secretariat, Secretary to the President and the Planning Commission.

Ordered also that the Resolution be published in the Gazette of India and the State Governments concerned be requested to publish the same in the State Gazettes for general information.

G. K. VIJ, Dy. Secy.

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

New Delhi, the 29th April 1960

No. 28/36/59/LRIV.—The following decision of Shri Salim M. Merchant, Additional Industrial Tribunal, Bombay, in respect of the matter referred to him under sub-section (1) of section 36A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) by the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 252 dated the 18th January, 1960 is hereby published for general information.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT ADDITIONAL INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL BOMBAY.

REFERENCE CGIT-No. 6 OF 1960

Employers in relation to the Bombay Port Trust, Bombay.
AND

Their workmen.

PRESENT

Shri Salim M. Merchant, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES

For the employers.—Shri S. D. Nariman, Legal Adviser to the Bombay Port Trust.

For the workmen.—Shri S. Maitra, General Secretary, The Bombay Port Trust General Workers' Union.

Shri S. J. Deshmukh, Assistant Secretary, Bombay Port Trust Employees' Union.

Bombay, the 23rd April 1960

STATE: Bombay

INDUSTRY: Ports and Docks.

DECISION

The Government of India by the Ministry of Labour and Employment's Order No. LRIV. 28(36)/59 dated 18th January 1960, made in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 36A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), has referred to me for interpretation paragraph 45 of the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in Ref. No. 5 of 1957, published with S.O. 1115 dated the 9th June 1958 in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3 sub-section (ii) dated 14th June 1958. The schedule to the order of reference is as follows:—

SCHEDULE

"Whether boys, cooks and bhandaries employed in the Chief Engineer's flotilla are entitled to uniforms in accordance with the principles laid down in paragraph 45 of the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, published with S.O. 1115 dated the 9th June 1958."

2. After the order was received on 21-1-1960, the usual notices were issued to the parties for filing their written statements. The statement of the Bombay Port Trust General Workers' Union was received on 8th February 1960, and the written statement in reply thereto on behalf of the Trustees of the Port of Bombay was received on 23rd February 1960 after which the dispute was heard on 18th April 1960.

3. This reference has been made in the following circumstances:

Issue No. (iv).—in Reference No. 5 of 1957 was in the following terms:—

"Should free uniforms be supplied to the crews of the Chief Engineer's flotilla, consisting of dredgers, launches, barges and salvage section boats?"

The award of the learned Tribunal, Shri A. Das Gupta, on this issue is contained in paragraphs 41 to 47 of his award dated 23-5-58. By paragraph 45 of his award the learned Tribunal laid down three principles on which uniforms should be granted to the workmen. In laying down those principles, the Tribunal observed as follows:—

"The accepted principles as they stand today on which uniforms are granted to workmen are:—

(1) Those who come in touch with the public in course of their duties.

(a) those who from the employers point of view should present a smart appearance and thereby maintain the prestige of the employers;

(b) those who require some identification for easy access to the place of their work and peaceful execution of their work.

(2) Those whose work requires a particular type of dress for their safety against any risk involved in such work.

(3) Those whose nature of work soil their clothes and reduce their life.

4. As the categories of workmen employed in the flotilla under the Chief Engineer and their duties had not been placed before the learned Adjudicator, he stated that he was not in a position to give a definite award with reference to individual categories of workmen but he directs that such uniforms shall be supplied to the members of the crew who are entitled to free supply of uniforms on the principles laid down by him on the scale on which comparable categories of workmen in the flotillas under the Deputy Conservator are supplied uniforms.

5. After the award was made and published, the employers desired their Chief Engineer to recommend which of the categories of workmen employed on the flotillas should, having regard to the nature of their duties, be supplied with free uniforms bearing in mind the principles governing the grant of free uniforms as laid down by the learned Adjudicator. The Chief Engineer by his report dated 17th January 1959 specified the different categories of workmen who were entitled to uniforms. With regard to the categories of masters, mates and seacunniess the Chief Engineer was of the opinion that they were not covered by any of the principles governing the grant of uniforms laid down in the award. He was of the opinion that if the directions of the Tribunal were to be strictly followed then these categories would not qualify for uniforms. However, in view of the comparatively small number of employees in these categories, he recommended that they should also be supplied with free uniforms as their exclusion was likely to give rise to discontent among the staff and since the whole of the crew working under these men would be provided with uniforms they may not be able to command the respect and attention due to them if they were not provided with uniforms as is being done in the case of their counter parts in the Deputy Conservator's Department.

6. With regard to the three categories under reference of cooks, boys and bhandaries, the Chief Engineer was of the opinion that they also were not covered by any of the three principles laid down in the award, "if a rigid interpretation was imposed." However, he was of the opinion that considerations of hygiene and cleanliness required that the incumbents of these posts should have clean clothes always; as such he recommended that they also be provided with uniforms.

7. The Chief Accountant of the Port Trust, to whom the recommendations of the Chief Engineer were referred, by his note dated 16th February 1959, observed with regard to masters, mates and seacunniess that it would be for consideration whether in view of the comparatively small number of employees in these categories and the fact that similar categories in the Port Department are already being supplied with free uniforms whether these categories should not also be supplied with free uniforms as recommended by the Chief Engineer.

8. With regard to cooks, boys and bhandaries, the Chief Accountant was of the opinion that the clothes of the men belonging to these categories get soiled in the course of their duties and that principle 3 in paragraph 45 of the award would be applicable to their case. He therefore observed, "there is, therefore, no objection to the proposed free supply of uniforms."

9. It appears that the matter was then placed before the Committee of the Port Trust which by Resolution No. 229 dated 10th March 1959 resolved that the directions in the award should be strictly construed. It, therefore, did not agree that masters, mates, seacunniess, cooks, boys and bhandaries should be issued uniforms.

10. The Bombay Port Trust General Workers' Union thereupon approached the Government and its claim was that under the directions contained in paragraph 45 of the award, masters, mates, seacunniess, cooks, boys and bhandaries employed under the Chief Engineer in the flotilla were entitled to uniforms. Certain correspondence ensued between the union and the Government and the Government by its letter No. 28/36/59/LRIV dated 12th February 1960 advised the union that, "having regard to the principles laid down in the award of the Tribunal, it is considered that the seacunniess, mates and masters are not entitled to uniforms. It is, therefore, not considered necessary to refer their case to a Tribunal". Government, however, was of the opinion that a doubt had arisen as to the interpretation of paragraph 45 of the award with regard to the supply of uniforms to boys, cooks and bhandaries employed under the Chief Engineer's flotilla and accordingly by the aforesaid Order of 18th January 1960, referred to the question of interpretation for decision to this Tribunal.

11. Before dealing with the reference on its merits, it is necessary to dispose of a claim made on behalf of masters, mates and seacunniess in the statement of claim of the Bombay Port Trust General Workers' Union. It is claimed by Shri S. Maltra, General Secretary of the union that under this reference the Tribunal should also consider the question whether masters, mates and seacunniess are also entitled to uniforms under the directions contained in paragraph 45 of the award. His argument is that it is the jurisdiction of the Tribunal to interpret a particular direction contained in an award and that when any party to the award raises doubts and difficulties as regards the correct interpretation of the award with regard to certain categories, it is incumbent on the Government to refer the question in its entirety for interpretation to the Tribunal. Whilst conceding that it is for the Government to decide whether a doubt or difficulty exists with regard to the interpretation of any provision of an award or settlement, he has argued that Government has no powers to give its own interpretation to any part of a settlement or award. According to him because the union had claimed that under the instant award masters, mates, seacunniess, boys, cooks and bhandaries were entitled to uniforms

Government should have referred the cases of all these six categories of workmen to the Tribunal for interpretation of these award and could not have excluded the three categories of masters, mates and seacunniess.

12. Shri Nariman, the Legal Adviser to the Port Trust, has opposed this claim and has rightly pointed out that under the provisions of section 36A (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, it is the Government which has to decide whether a particular doubt or difficulty with regard to the interpretation of an award should be referred to a Tribunal or not. This is borne out by the language of section 36A (1) which provides as follows:—

"If, in the opinion of the appropriate Government, any difficulty or doubt arises as to the interpretation of any provision of an award or settlement, it may refer the question to such Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal as it may think fit."

In my opinion the words, "if in the opinion of the appropriate Government", makes it abundantly clear that it is for the appropriate Government to decide whether any difficulty or doubt exists as to the interpretation of any provision of an award or settlement and whether the same should be referred for interpretation to a Tribunal. In the ultimate analysis the doubt or difficulty is that of the Government as under the scheme of the Act it is the responsibility of the Government to enforce the implementation of an award.

13. In my opinion, it is completely within the power of the Government to decide that doubts or difficulties do exist with regard to the interpretation of the provisions of an award or settlement with regard to its application to certain categories of employees and not with regard to some others and this is exactly what the Government has done in this case. After considering the submissions of both parties the Government was of the opinion that a doubt or difficulty existed only with regard to that portion of the directions in the award relating to the grant of uniforms to the categories consisting of boys, cooks and bhandaries and not with regard to masters, mates and seacunniess and it has therefore referred the question of the former three categories to me. If Shri Maitra's contention were to be accepted, then Government would have no discretion at all with regard to which matters to refer or not to refer for interpretation to the Tribunal under section 36A (1). Such an interpretation would reduce the opening words of the section "if in the opinion of the appropriate Government" as having no meaning whatsoever which would be against recognised principles of construction or statutes. If I were to consider the cases of masters, mates and seacunniess I would be travelling beyond the scope of this reference and would thereby exceeding my jurisdiction. I, therefore, reject the contention of Shri Maitra and shall confine my decision to the cases of boys, cooks and bhandaries only.

14. The representatives of both the unions have argued that boys, cooks and bhandaries are entitled to free supply of uniforms as they are covered by principle 3 laid down in paragraph 45 of the award. Principle 3 is as follows:—

"Those whose nature of work soil their clothes and reduce their life."

15. The Bombay Port Trust General Workers' Union in its statement of claim has stated that the clothes of the workmen of these three categories get soiled by the very nature of their duties, which is not denied by the Port Trust. Shri S. D. Nariman, the Legal Adviser for the Port Trust has, however, argued that though their clothes do get soiled by the very nature of their duties these three categories of workmen would not be entitled to uniforms, unless it is also shown by the union that such soiling reduces the life of their clothes. The representatives of the unions have argued that the very act of soiling the clothes would reduce the life of the clothes because it would necessarily require the clothes to be washed more often, thus reducing their life. Shri Deshmukh has argued that the word "and" in principle 3 should be interpreted as meaning "therefore" or "thereby". Shri Nariman, on the other hand has argued that the direction should be strictly construed and that no additional words should be read into the directions which are not there. For that proposition he has relied upon the decision of the Hon'ble Privy Council in the case of Shrimati Renula Bose vs. Manmatha Nath Bose and others, respondents [1945 AIR (P.C.) page 108] where his Lordship the Chief Justice Lord Goddard observed, "it is contrary to all rules of construction to read words into an Act which are not there, unless it is absolutely necessary to do so." He has also relied upon a judgment of the Calcutta High Court in the case of the Corporation of Calcutta, appellant vs. the Province of Bengal respondent (A.I.R. 1940 Calcutta page 47) where it was observed, "it is a fundamental principle of construction that ordinarily words should not be added to a statute. It is also a fundamental principle that ordinarily words used by the Legislature are not to be ignored. No portion of a statutory enactment ought to be disregarded and every word used should, if possible, be given effect to. It is only when there is a manifest absurdity or inconsistency that the paste and scissor method is to be applied."

16 No doubt these are the correct principles when the terms of any statute have to be interpreted and those principles would equally well apply when considering the directions contained in an award of an Industrial Tribunal under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The point here is whether it can be said that by the very fact that the clothes of the boys cooks and bhandaries get soiled, it also reduces the life of their clothing. The duties of these three categories of workmen have been stated in paragraph 9 of the union's statement of claim as follows—

"The nature and duties of a cook is indoor, preparing food for officers on dredgers and to attend to work connected with cooking, that of a boy is essentially indoor, attending to officers for serving food, cleaning dishes, utensils and other work of officers, and that of a bhandari is preparation of food for the crew of vessels to which they are attached."

17 These duties have not been denied by the Port Trust in its written statement. Shri Maitra and Shri Deshmukh for the workmen have argued that in discharging these duties, the clothes of these workmen get so soiled that it reduces their life. Shri Narman on the other hand has referred to the directions given by the same learned Adjudicator in his award in a dispute between the employers in relation to the Port Commissioners Calcutta and their workmen (Reference No 1 of 1956—Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II Section 3 dated 30.1.58 p 245 at pp 272 to 275) where the workers in the coal docks were not granted uniforms even though the Tribunal came to the conclusion that their clothes get soiled by the very nature of their duties. But there the demand was in addition to uniforms also for overcoats which could protect both the clothes and the person of the workers in the coal docks and the Tribunal found that in actual practice those workmen were using gunny bags and accordingly directed that they should be supplied with one gunny bag each year. Evidently in that case the demand for uniforms was not granted because it was felt that the gunny bags would act as a protection against the ordinary clothing getting soiled as also protect their body from the dripping from the coal baskets. I do not think that from the directions of that award it can be argued that in the instant case the Tribunal did not mean to award uniforms to boys cooks and bhandaries. The award under reference has accepted liberalisation of the principles on which uniforms should be supplied and I would interpret the award in that spirit. I think the Chief Accountant of the Port Trust was right in opining that principle 3 laid down by the award should apply to these three categories. Considering the nature of their duties I am satisfied that their ordinary clothes get soiled in such a manner as to reduce their life.

18 I, therefore, hold that the boys, cooks and bhandaries employed in the Chief Engineer's flotilla are entitled to uniforms in accordance with the third principle laid down in paragraph 45 of the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta published with S.O. 1115 dated the 9th June 1958 and I give my decision accordingly.

No order as to costs

(Sd) SALIM M MERCHANT,

Presiding Officer,
Central Government Additional Industrial
Tribunal, Bombay

A L HANNA, Under Secy

(Directorate General of Resettlement and Employment)

RESOLUTION

New Delhi, the 26th April 1960

No EP I(28)(5)/59—The question of providing employment assistance to domestic servants has been under consideration of the Government of India for some time. A Scheme to set up on a pilot basis a Special Employment Office in Delhi as a unit of the National Employment Service to deal with the registration and placement of domestic servants in Delhi, was approved by the Indian Labour Conference and in pursuance thereof an Employment Office has been set up in Delhi. As envisaged in the Scheme the Government of India have decided to set up a Committee to advise the authorities concerned on the working of the Employment Office and on the steps to be taken for the welfare of domestic servants.

2 The Committee will be constituted as below—

- (i) Director of Employment and Training, Delhi Administration, Delhi Chairman
- (ii) Shri Naval Prabhakar, M.P.
- (iii) Shrimati Raksha Saran, Chairman, Delhi Social Welfare Board, New Delhi
- (iv) Kumari Shakuntla Sulhan Secretary, Delhi Congress Rachnanak Samiti
- (v) Employment Officer—Secretary

S ABDUL QADIR, Jt Secy

